

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Case No. 18-20239  
Hon. Denise Page Hood

JARVUS JOHNSON and  
CHRISTOPHER WADE,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER DENYING WITHOUT PREJUDICE DEFENDANT  
JARVUS JOHNSON'S DISCOVERY MOTIONS [Dkt. Nos. 40-44]**

Defendant Jarvus Johnson filed the following motions:

- A. For Notice Regarding 404(b) Evidence [#40];
- B. For Disclosure of Brady Materials [#41];
- C. For Discovery and Inspection [#42]; and
- D. For Government Agents to Retain Rough Notes [#44].

Defendant Christopher Wade filed a Notice of Joinder/Concurrence in all four motions. The Government filed a global response to the motions. No reply was filed. Defendant Jarvus Johnson also filed a document titled "Notices of Request for Discovery" [#43].

In its response, the Government represented that it is aware of, and to date has complied with its obligations pursuant to : (1) Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 16; (2) the *Jencks* Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3500; (3) the doctrine set forth in *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), and *Giglio v. United States*, 405 U.S. 150 (1972); and (4) the Eastern District of Michigan’s standing order for discovery. The Government states that it will continue to provide discovery as required under those obligations. The Government asserts that it will oppose any excessive discovery requests but indicates that, as of the filing of its response and the hearing, there were no disputes with any defendant regarding the scope of discoverable material. Defendants Jarvus Johnson and Christopher Wade indicated at the hearing that the Government’s representations are accurate.

Based on the Government’s response brief and the concession of Defendant Jarvus Johnson or Christopher Wade at the hearing that the Government has complied with its discovery obligations to date, the Court finds that the Government has provided Defendant with all of the required materials. And, as the Government acknowledged its obligations under *Jencks*, *Brady*, *Giglio*, and the Court’s Standing Order for Discovery and Inspection, the Court DENIES AS MOOT Defendant’s Motions [Dkt. Nos. 40-44], but the denial of each Motion is WITHOUT PREJUDICE and may be revisited to the extent the Government fails to provide any evidence

required by law.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/Denise Page Hood

Denise Page Hood

Chief Judge, United States District Court

Dated: June 20, 2018

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record on June 20, 2018, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/LaShawn R. Saulsberry

Case Manager